

PERMIT CHECK LIST

The following people have reviewed the permit:

Reviewing Permitting Engineer: _____

Air Inspector: _____

Air Compliance Manager: _____

Date: January 10, 2008

Source Name: Lyon Shipyard, Inc. Registration No: 61274 Id. No.: 51-710-00249

Source Location: Foot of Brown Avenue, Norfolk, VA

Mail Address: P.O. Box 2180, Norfolk, VA 23501

Source Status: _____ Greenfield ☒ Currently operating

Source Classification: _____ Minor ☒ SynMinor _____ State Major _____ PSD Major _____ TV Major

Permit Action: Lyon Shipyard has submitted a request to clarify several conditions of its current SOP. The facility also wishes to have the conditions regarding the use of thinners/solvents re-evaluated, and the pertinent conditions changed accordingly. The permit is also being updated to reflect current boilerplate language and to ensure the synthetic minor status of the facility.

Permit Action Program:

_____ NSR ☒ SOP _____ TV _____ Maj HAP

Permit Action Type:

_____ New / Article 6 Modification (delete one) ☒ Significant Amendment

_____ Minor Amendment/Modification _____ Administrative Amendment _____ Renewal

_____ State Major _____ PSD _____ Non-Attainment _____ General

Y (Y/N) Permit Includes All Emission Units at Source.

Y (Y/N) Permit Allows Source to avoid Title V/MACT/etc.

After this permit, source is: _____ Major (A) _____ Minor (B) ☒ Synthetic minor (SM)
(HAP Pollutant, VOC Pollutant, PM/PM-10 Pollutant)

Permit Application Review

_____ Permit application submitted, or ☒ Letter Request

Application Received Date: September 6, 2007

Application Complete Date: December 11, 2007

Permit Deadline Date: March 10, 2008

☒ Document Certification Form received

N/A Confidential information with sanitized copy. If yes, which sections:

_____ throughputs _____ individual pollutants _____ flow diagrams _____ calculations

_____ process descriptions _____ other (describe)

If yes, has claim been accepted by DEQ? (Y/N) - Date of letter: _____

N/A Copy of letter from local official for greenfield, or major modified sources

N/A Copy of letter sent to FLM if applicable. (Comments)

N/A Notification of Affected State(s)

This permit supersedes permit(s) dated December 21, 1998.

Regulatory Review

BACT Determination (check one):

_____ [Control Strategy/Equipment] @ _____ % efficiency for the control of _____ meets BACT

Regulatory Review (cont.)

(Comments)_____, or

☒ TV/SOP/BACT not applicable. (SOP Amendment)

N (Y/N) NSPS/MACT/NESHAPS Applicability: If Y, Subpart(s):

_____ NSPS

_____ MACT

_____ NESHAPS

Y (Y/N) Existing Rules (9 VAC 5 Chapter 40) Applicability: If Y, Rule(s): Rule 4-1 Visible Emissions and Fugitive Dust/Emissions

Toxic Pollutants (check one):

_____ Exempt, or ☒ in compliance with **9 VAC 5-60-220**, or _____ not evaluated

[Comments: _____]

Modeling (check one):

☒ Attached (including background monitors), or

_____ Copy of approval letter from modeling section,

_____ No modeling required by agency policy (< modeling significance levels, etc.)

Site Suitability:

☒ Site suitable from an air pollution standpoint, inspection date 7/24/2007.

Y Calculation sheet(s) attached

N (Y/N) NSR Netting _____ Comments (Explain Permit History):

N (Y/N) (CAM) Compliance Assurance Monitoring Applicable

Permit includes: _____ Stack Testing _____ CEM ☒ VEE by source

Public Participation

Y (Y/N) Public Noticed. If yes, Public Notice Date:

_____ (Y/N) Public Notice Comments. If yes, number and nature of comments:

_____ (Y/N) Public Hearing. If yes, Public Hearing Date:

EPA Review

N (Y/N) EPA Review. If yes, Date proposed permit sent to EPA _____.

N (Y/N) EPA Comments. If yes, give a brief summary _____.

Comments: Lyon Shipyard was issued an SOP on May 22, 1998 to establish the facility as synthetic minor for HAPs, VOCs, PM, and PM-10. The 1998 SOP served to keep the facility out of the Title V program and out of the Shipyard MACT that came into effect in 1995. The SOP was amended on December 21, 1998 to include two small Navy surplus boilers that were found to be exempt from NSR permitting.

Condition 4 of the 1998 SOP establishes a combined throughput limit for "coatings, as applied, including thinners and solvents." Condition 14 requires the facility to keep records of the throughputs of coatings (14a.) and thinners/solvents (14b.). On July 24, 2007, an inspection of the facility revealed that Lyon was not accurately accounting for the VOC emissions from the use of thinners and solvents, as outlined in the permit. Inspector Brad White issued an RCA to the facility, requiring them to develop and implement a procedure to account for fugitive solvent emissions. This permit request was submitted in response to the compliance issue.

The current permit was written to account for the emissions from the use of coatings and thinners; however, Lyon does not currently track the emissions from the use of thinners/solvents because it no longer thins its coatings. The solvents currently used at the facility are used only to clean the paint guns and hoses. From the

Regulatory Review (cont.)

wording of the current conditions, the facility was under the impression that it was only required to report the emissions from the coatings and thinners “as applied.” Because Lyon no longer “applies” thinners during the coating process, the facility has not been documenting the emissions from the use of solvents. Furthermore, Lyon contends that the VOC emissions from the use of solvents to clean paint guns is minimal, as the system is partially enclosed. (The guns are filled with thinner/solvent, and the thinner/solvent is then shot through the guns into a pot.) The permit must, therefore, be clarified to prevent any further confusion on this issue.

In order to facilitate a review of the facility’s current solvent usage, Lyon submitted the MSDS for each of the solvents used to clean the spray guns and hoses, as well as a proposed maximum expected throughput of 1000 gal/yr. The facility also submitted the results of a test conducted on site to determine the amount of VOC lost during gun cleaning. The results of the test showed that very little, if any, VOC/HAP is lost during this process. A maximum of 1% loss was proposed by the facility. Unfortunately, the results were not replicated, and DEQ air permitting and compliance staff were not permitted to witness the testing procedures. Thus, the results of Lyon’s tests could not be used as justification. Instead, the facility and TRO permitting and compliance staff agreed to assume a 5% loss. Currently, the solvents used in the gun-cleaning process are recovered, and stored on site in waste containers. The solvent is then handled by a hazardous waste company. The facility has agreed to track the monthly/annual throughput assuming the haz. waste is 100% solvent (even though it also contains paint waste). At 5% loss, this will provide a conservative estimate of the VOC/HAP emissions. The predicted emissions assuming 1000 gal/yr at 5% loss are very small; however, they must be included in the facility-wide VOC/HAP limits (and also tracked by the facility) to ensure that the facility remains below major thresholds. Conditions 6, 11c, and 11f have been included for the solvents. A recordkeeping requirement for the hazardous waste manifests has also been included in Condition 11g to allow DEQ compliance staff to verify the facility's monthly/annual solvent usage tracking.

During the processing of this permit request, it was determined that several updates to the current SOP are also necessary. The SOP was written in 1998, and the facility’s coating processes have changed since this time. The facility is synthetic minor for VOC/HAPs, so it is important to evaluate Lyon’s current operations to ensure that the permit allows the facility to remain below major thresholds. Also, the facility is currently emitting an additional HAP, Ethylbenzene, which needs to be added to the permit. The Methyl Ethyl Ketone in the current SOP must also be removed, as this HAP has been removed from the toxics list (in any case, the facility is no longer using this HAP). In addition, there is some concern that the current throughput limit of 52,550 gal of coating/yr does not allow the facility to demonstrate compliance with the permitted emission limits for VOC/HAP. Thus, the facility may not be adequately protected as a synthetic minor source.

In order to determine whether the current throughput allows the facility to show compliance with the VOC and HAP emission limits, the maximum lb/gal VOC, Xylene, and Ethylbenzene contents were determined from the MSDS. The HAP contents were then used to calculate the predicted emissions at the current permitted throughput of 52,550 gal/yr. The resulting emissions were well above the 10 ton/yr and 25 ton/yr major thresholds for HAPs. To correct this, TRO worked with the facility to come up with a more representative throughput. The facility has requested a coating throughput of 10,200 gal/yr, which will allow the facility to expand its coating operations in the future. This throughput corresponds to emission rates of 9.3 ton/yr for Xylene and 9.2 ton/yr for Ethylbenzene. When combined with the emissions from the gun cleaning operations, the facility-wide emission limits become 9.4 ton/yr for Xylene and 9.2 ton/yr for Ethylbenzene. Thus, the new coating throughput and emission limits will provide flexibility for possible expansion, and still allow the facility to remain below major HAP thresholds. As all HAPs are VOCs, the VOC limits in Conditions 8 and 9 have also been established as the total HAP limits in Conditions 19 and 20.

Regulatory Review (cont.)

The facility will be required to keep records of both the throughputs of all coatings and solvents and the emissions of VOC and HAP from the use of these products. Emissions tracking will give the facility some flexibility in the types of products used. (This approach will require the facility to remain below both the throughput and emission limits, but will not specifically restrict them to a max. lb/gal VOC/HAP content).

Because all emissions from the coating process are fugitive, the changes to the coating operations were not evaluated for Article 6 permitting applicability. Article 6 does not apply to sources or modifications for which all of the potential emissions are fugitive in nature.

Although Article 6 does not apply for the criteria pollutants, the PTE for Xylene and Ethylbenzene were found to be above the exemption thresholds in 9 VAC 5-60-200, so the existing source toxics rule is applicable. After consultation with Central Office modeling staff, the predicted emissions were modeled using the volume source SCREEN3 model. The model was carried out using the following input parameters: the lb/hr emissions rate assuming the maximum expected gal/hr throughput to the spray guns, the vertical and horizontal dimensions of the shrouds used during the outdoor coating operations, and the average HAP release height. The resulting concentrations were found to be below both the hourly and annual SAAC levels for Xylene and Ethylbenzene. The HAP emission limits have been included in a State-Only Enforceable section at the end of the permit to emphasize that the VA toxics regulations have not been SIP-approved.

The facility has not requested any changes to the abrasive blasting operations, and DEQ staff has found no compliance issues with this process. The current conditions and limits are more than adequate to account for the facility's current and future blasting operations.

The permit has been updated with current boilerplate language. Condition 10 (Shipyard MOU language) will remain in the permit for the control of fugitive emissions from the outdoor coating and blasting operations. Condition 11h. has been added to include the recordkeeping required by Condition 10b.

This permit action requires/changes the case-by-case determination of the HAP and VOC emission limits. It will be processed as a significant amendment to the current SOP. A 30-day public comment period will be necessary for the changes and to enforce the synthetic minor status for HAPs.

Final Recommendation: Recommend Approval.

Environmental Engineer's Signature: _____

Air Permit Manager's Signature: _____

January 10, 2008

Mr. George C. Lyon, Jr.
President
Lyon Shipyard, Inc.
P.O. Box 2180
Norfolk, Virginia 23501

Location: Norfolk
Registration No.: 61274

Dear Mr. Lyon:

Attached is a significant amendment to your state operating permit dated December 21, 1998 to operate a ship repair facility in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Regulations for the Control and Abatement of Air Pollution. This amended permit supersedes your permit dated December 21, 1998.

This permit contains legally enforceable conditions. Failure to comply may result in a Notice of Violation and/or civil charges. Please read all permit conditions carefully.

The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) deemed the application complete on November 18, 2007 and has determined that the application meets the requirements of 9 VAC 5-80-990 A for a significant amendment to a state operating permit. The Department solicited written public comments by placing a newspaper advertisement in the {insert name of newspaper} on {insert date of publication}. The required comment period provided by 9 VAC 5-80-1170 D expired on {insert date comment period ended}.

This permit approval to operate shall not relieve Lyon Shipyard, Inc. of the responsibility to comply with all other local, state, and federal permit regulations.

The Board's Regulations as contained in Title 9 of the Virginia Administrative Code 5-170-200 provide that you may request a formal hearing from this case decision by filing a petition with the Board within 30 days after this case decision notice was mailed or delivered to you. 9 VAC 5-170-200 provides that you may request direct consideration of the decision by the Board

if the Director of the DEQ made the decision. Please consult the relevant regulations for additional requirements for such requests.

As provided by Rule 2A:2 of the Supreme Court of Virginia, you have 30 days from the date you actually received this permit or the date on which it was mailed to you, whichever occurred first, within which to initiate an appeal of this decision by filing a Notice of Appeal with:

David K. Paylor, Director
Department of Environmental Quality
P. O. Box 1105
Richmond, VA 23218-1105

If this permit was delivered to you by mail, three days are added to the thirty-day period in which to file an appeal. Please refer to Part Two A of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia for information on the required content of the Notice of Appeal and for additional requirements governing appeals from decisions of administrative agencies.

If you have any questions concerning this permit, please contact Lindsey M. Evans at (757) 518-2168.

Sincerely,

Jane A. Workman
Air Permit Manager

JAW/LME/61274_001_08_SOPsigamd

Attachment: Permit

cc: Director, OAPP (electronic file submission)
Manager, Data Analysis (electronic file submission)
Chief, Air Enforcement Branch (3AP13), U.S. EPA, Region III
Manager/Inspector, Air Compliance

STATIONARY SOURCE PERMIT TO OPERATE

This permit supersedes your permit dated December 21, 1998.

In compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act and the Commonwealth of Virginia Regulations for the Control and Abatement of Air Pollution,

Lyon Shipyard, Inc.
P.O. Box 2180
Norfolk, Virginia 23501
Registration No.: 61274

is authorized to operate

a ship repair facility

located at

Lyon Shipyard Main Yard
Foot of Brown Avenue
Norfolk, Virginia

in accordance with the Conditions of this permit.

Approved on

DRAFT.

Francis L. Daniel

Permit consists of 7 pages.
Permit Conditions 1 to 20.

INTRODUCTION

1. This permit approval is based on the permit application dated August 28, 1995, including amendment information dated January 20, 1998, March 16, 1998, November 18, 1998, September 6, 2007, October 30, 2007, November 18, 2007, December 5, 2007, and December 11, 2007. Any changes in the permit application specifications or any existing facilities which alter the impact of the facility on air quality may require a permit. Failure to obtain such a permit prior to construction may result in enforcement action.

Words or terms used in this permit shall have meanings as provided in 9 VAC 5-10-10 of the State Air Pollution Control Board Regulations for the Control and Abatement of Air Pollution. The regulatory reference or authority for each condition is listed in parentheses () after each condition.

Annual requirements to fulfill legal obligations to maintain current stationary source emissions data will necessitate a prompt response by the permittee to requests by the DEQ or the Board for information to include, as appropriate: process and production data; changes in control equipment; and operating schedules. Such requests for information from the DEQ will either be in writing or by personal contact.

The availability of information submitted to the DEQ or the Board will be governed by applicable provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, §§ 2.2-3700 through 2.2-3714 of the Code of Virginia, § 10.1-1314 (addressing information provided to the Board) of the Code of Virginia, and 9 VAC 5-170-60 of the State Air Pollution Control Board Regulations. Information provided to federal officials is subject to appropriate federal law and regulations governing confidentiality of such information.

PROCESS REQUIREMENTS

2. **Equipment List** - Equipment at this facility consists of the following:

Equipment to be operated at this facility			
Reference No.	Equipment Description	Rated Capacity	Original Permit Date
1-4	Four (4) abrasive grit blasting units (nozzles as sources)	4 tons/hr total	May 22, 1998
5-7	Three (3) airless pumps with paint spray guns	180 gal/hr total	May 22, 1998
8-9	Two (2) Cyclotherm MC-1500 distillate oil-fired boilers	3.45 mmBtu/hr each	December 21, 1998 (exempt from Article 6 permitting)

Specifications included in the permit under this Condition are for informational purposes only and do not form enforceable terms or conditions of the permit.
(9 VAC 5-80-850)

3. **VOC Work Practice Standards** - At all times the disposal of volatile organic compounds shall be accomplished by taking measures, to the extent practicable, consistent with air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions. Volatile organic compounds shall not be intentionally spilled, discarded in sewers which are not connected to a treatment plant, or stored in open containers, or handled in any other manner that would result in evaporation beyond that consistent with air pollution practices for minimizing emissions.
(9 VAC 5-50-20 F and 9 VAC 5-80-850)

OPERATING LIMITATIONS

4. **Throughput** - The throughput of abrasive blast material shall not exceed 9,500 tons, calculated monthly as the sum of each consecutive 12-month period. Compliance for the consecutive 12-month period shall be demonstrated monthly by adding the total for the most recently completed calendar month to the individual monthly totals for the preceding 11 months.
(9 VAC 5-80-850)
5. **Throughput** - The throughput of coatings, as applied to marine vessels and marine parts, shall not exceed 10,200 gallons per year, calculated monthly as the sum of each consecutive 12-month period. Compliance for the consecutive 12-month period shall be demonstrated monthly by adding the total for the most recently completed calendar month to the individual monthly totals for the preceding 11 months.
(9 VAC 5-80-850)
6. **Throughput** - The throughput of solvents used to clean the spray guns and associated equipment shall not exceed 1,000 gallons per year, calculated monthly as the sum of each consecutive 12-month period. Compliance for the consecutive 12-month period shall be demonstrated monthly by adding the total for the most recently completed calendar month to the individual monthly totals for the preceding 11 months.
(9 VAC 5-80-850)

EMISSION LIMITS

7. **Process Emission Limits** - Emissions from the abrasive blasting operations shall not exceed the limits specified below:

Particulate Matter (PM)	80.0 lbs/hr	95.0 tons/yr
PM-10	40.0 lbs/hr	47.5 tons/yr

These emissions are derived from the estimated overall emission contribution from operating limits. Exceedance of the operating limits may be considered credible evidence of the exceedance of emission limits. Compliance with these emission limits may be determined as stated in Condition number 4.
(9 VAC 5-80-850)

8. **Process Emission Limits** - Emissions from the spray coating operations shall not exceed the limits specified below:

Volatile Organic Compounds	594.0 lbs/hr	16.8 tons/yr
-------------------------------	--------------	--------------

These emissions are derived from the estimated overall emission contribution from operating limits. Exceedance of the operating limits may be considered credible evidence of the exceedance of emission limits. Compliance with these emission limits may be determined as stated in Condition numbers 5 and 11e.
(9 VAC 5-80-850)

9. **Facility-wide Emission Limits** - Total emissions from the operation of the ship repair facility shall not exceed the limits specified below:

Particulate Matter (PM)	95.4 tons/yr
PM-10	47.7 tons/yr
Sulfur Dioxide	15.5 tons/yr
Nitrogen Oxides (as NO ₂)	4.4 tons/yr
Carbon Monoxide	1.1 tons/yr
Volatile Organic Compounds	17.0 tons/yr

These emissions are derived from the estimated overall emission contribution from operating limits. Exceedance of the operating limits may be considered credible evidence of the exceedance of emission limits. Compliance with these emission limits may be determined as stated in Condition numbers 4 through 6, 11e and 11f.
(9 VAC 5-80-850)

10. The permittee shall:

- a. Establish, implement, and submit a written policy and procedure for outdoor abrasive blasting and spray painting operations which takes “reasonable precautions to prevent particulate matter from becoming air borne.”
- b. Install wind direction and wind speed instruments located conveniently to central shipyard outdoor abrasive blasting and spray painting operations, and shall maintain records of wind direction and speed.
- c. Minimize, or if necessary terminate, outdoor abrasive blasting or spray painting operations if the prevailing wind direction and speed cause particulate matter from such activities to be transported to adjacent property.
- d. Terminate abrasive blasting or spray painting operations if the wind speed exceeds a sustained 25 miles per hour at the facility, unless effective containment methods are utilized or wind direction is such that particulate matter will not be improperly transported to adjacent property.
- e. Use adequate containment methods such as curtains and shrouds where possible and practical, and locate the operations to minimize particulate matter from being transported to adjacent property.
- f. Use airless spray equipment and spray in a horizontal to down pattern to the maximum extent possible and practicable.
- g. Endeavor to conduct abrasive blasting and spray painting operations in a manner consistent with the Federal Clean Air Act, Virginia Air Pollution Control Law, and regulations promulgated there under, as applicable.

(9 VAC 5- 80-850)

RECORDS

11. **On Site Records** - The permittee shall maintain records of emission data and operating parameters as necessary to demonstrate compliance with this permit. The content and format of such records shall be arranged with the Director, Tidewater Regional Office. These records shall include, but are not limited to:
- Annual throughput of abrasive blast material, calculated monthly as the sum of each consecutive 12-month period. Compliance for the consecutive 12-month period shall be demonstrated monthly by adding the total for the most recently completed calendar month to the individual monthly totals for the preceding 11 months.
 - Annual throughput of coatings, as applied to marine vessels and marine parts, calculated monthly as the sum of each consecutive 12-month period. Compliance for the consecutive 12-month period shall be demonstrated monthly by adding the total for the most recently completed calendar month to the individual monthly totals for the preceding 11 months.
 - Annual throughput of solvents used to clean the spray guns and associated equipment, calculated monthly as the sum of each consecutive 12-month period. Compliance for the consecutive 12-month period shall be demonstrated monthly by adding the total for the most recently completed calendar month to the individual monthly totals for the preceding 11 months.
 - Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) or other vendor information as approved by DEQ showing the VOC and HAP contents for each coating and solvent used.
 - Annual emissions (in tons/yr) of VOC, each HAP, and all HAPs from the spray coating operations, using calculation methods approved by the Director, Tidewater Regional Office to verify compliance with the emissions limitations in Conditions 8, 9, 19 and 20.
 - Annual emissions (in tons/yr) of VOC, each HAP, and all HAPs from the gun cleaning operations to verify compliance with the emissions limitations in Conditions 9 and 20. These emissions shall be calculated assuming a 5% VOC/HAP loss from the process. The annual emissions shall be calculated monthly as the sum of each consecutive 12-month period.
 - Quarterly hazardous waste manifests, detailing the quantity of solvents recovered from the gun cleaning operations.
 - Records of wind direction and speed for the outdoor abrasive blasting and spray painting operations, as required by Condition 10b.

All records shall be available for inspection by the DEQ. The records outlined in Conditions 11a. through 11g. above shall be current for the most recent five years. The records outlined in Condition 11h. above shall be current for the most recent three years.

(9 VAC 5-80-850)

GENERAL CONDITIONS

12. **Right of Entry** - The permittee shall allow authorized local, state, and federal representatives, upon the presentation of credentials:
- To enter upon the permittee's premises on which the facility is located or in which any records are required to be kept under the terms and conditions of this permit;

- b. To have access to and copy at reasonable times any records required to be kept under the terms and conditions of this permit or the State Air Pollution Control Board Regulations;
- c. To inspect at reasonable times any facility, equipment, or process subject to the terms and conditions of this permit or the State Air Pollution Control Board Regulations; and
- d. To sample or test at reasonable times.

For purposes of this condition, the time for inspection shall be deemed reasonable during regular business hours or whenever the facility is in operation. Nothing contained herein shall make an inspection time unreasonable during an emergency.

(9 VAC 5-170-130 and 9 VAC 5-80-850)

13. **Notification for Facility or Control Equipment Malfunction** - The permittee shall furnish notification to the Director, Tidewater Regional Office of malfunctions of the affected facility or related air pollution control equipment that may cause excess emissions for more than one hour, by facsimile transmission, telephone, or telegraph. Such notification shall be made as soon as practicable but no later than four daytime business hours after the malfunction is discovered. The permittee shall provide a written statement giving all pertinent facts, including the estimated duration of the breakdown, within two weeks of discovery of the malfunction. When the condition causing the failure or malfunction has been corrected and the equipment is again in operation, the permittee shall notify the Director, Tidewater Regional Office in writing.

(9 VAC 5-20-180 C and 9 VAC 5-80-850)

14. **Violation of Ambient Air Quality Standard** - The permittee shall, upon request of the DEQ, reduce the level of operation or shut down a facility, as necessary to avoid violating any primary ambient air quality standard and shall not return to normal operation until such time as the ambient air quality standard will not be violated.

(9 VAC 5-20-180 I and 9 VAC 5-80-850)

15. **Maintenance/Operating Procedures** - At all times, including periods of start-up, shutdown, and malfunction, the permittee shall, to the extent practicable, maintain and operate the affected source, including associated air pollution control equipment, in a manner consistent with good air pollution control practices for minimizing emissions.

(9 VAC 5-50-20 E and 9 VAC 5-80-850)

16. **Permit Suspension/Revocation** - This permit may be revoked if the permittee:

- a. Knowingly makes material misstatements in the permit application or any amendments to it;
- b. Fails to comply with the terms or conditions of this permit;
- c. Fails to comply with any emission standards applicable to a permitted emissions unit;
- d. Causes emissions from this facility which result in violations of, or interferes with the attainment and maintenance of, any ambient air quality standard;
- e. Fails to operate this facility in conformance with any applicable control strategy, including any emission standards or emission limitations, in the State Implementation Plan in effect at the time that an application for this permit is submitted;

f. Fails to comply with the applicable provisions of Articles 6, 8 and 9 of 9 VAC 5 Chapter 80.
(9 VAC 5-80-1010)

17. **Change of Ownership** - In the case of a transfer of ownership of a stationary source, the new owner shall abide by any current permit issued to the previous owner. The new owner shall notify the Director, Tidewater Regional Office of the change of ownership within 30 days of the transfer.
(9 VAC 5-80-940)

18. **Permit Copy** - The permittee shall keep a copy of this permit on the premises of the facility to which it applies.
(9 VAC 5-80-860 D)

STATE-ONLY ENFORCEABLE REQUIREMENTS

19. **Process Emission Limits** - Emissions from the spray coating operations shall not exceed the limits specified below:

Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs as VOCs)

Xylene (CAS #1330-20-7)	9.3 ton/yr
Ethylbenzene (CAS # 100-41-4)	9.2 ton/yr
Total HAPs (as VOCs)	16.8 ton/yr

Compliance with these emission limits may be determined as stated in Condition numbers 5 and 11e.
(9 VAC 5-80-850 and 9 VAC 5-60-220)

20. **Facility-wide Emission Limits** - Total emissions from the operation of the ship repair facility shall not exceed the limits specified below:

Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs as VOCs)

Xylene (CAS #1330-20-7)	9.4 ton/yr
Ethylbenzene (CAS #100-41-4)	9.2 ton/yr
Total HAPs (as VOCs)	17.0 ton/yr

Compliance with these emission limits may be determined as stated in Condition numbers 5, 6, 11e, and 11f.
(9 VAC 5-80-850 and 9 VAC 5-60-220)

DRAFT PERMIT APPROVAL FORM

Department of Environmental Quality
Tidewater Regional Office
5636 Southern Blvd.
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23462

Instructions:

The "Draft Permit Approval Form" provides the owner or certified company official an opportunity to accept or suggest appropriate changes to a draft permit. If a signed form is not received within one (1) week of the date of receipt of the draft permit, DEQ will assume that the draft permit is considered acceptable and will proceed with processing the permit. **Please check the applicable statement(s) below after thoroughly reviewing the draft permit. Forms may be returned by facsimile to 757-518-2009, Attention: Ms. Lindsey M. Evans or Ms. Jane A. Workman.**

- _____ The owner or certified company official agrees with the conditions of the draft permit dated _____ . Please proceed to issue the permit with no change.
- _____ The owner or certified company official finds condition number(s) _____ of the draft permit dated _____ unacceptable.
- _____ The suggested changes are attached for your consideration.
- _____ The owner or certified company official requests further discussion with DEQ regarding the above referenced condition(s).

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Title: _____

Facility: _____

Date: _____